

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this Amendment, the specification has been amended, Claims 12 to 25 have been canceled and Claims 1, 4 and 9, are amended. Therefore, Claims 1-11 and 26 are pending.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

On page 2 of the Office Action, numbered paragraph 6, the Examiner has objected to the use of the trade mark MICROSTRATEGY. We believe this to be an error and that the Examiner intended to object to the use of the name Microsoft Internet Explorer, since the word MICROSTRATEGY does not appear in the application. Thus, the specification has been amended on page 24 to state that "The PC 102 is arranged to support a web browser application, for example the INTERNET EXPLORER application available from Microsoft Corporation." It is believed that this amendment should address the trademark issue. Page 24 was also amended to add the "." punctuation mark at the end of the description of Figure 21.

Also on page 2 of the Office Action, numbered paragraph 7, Claim 9 has been objected to for containing a typographical error. Unfortunately, the Examiner has identified the wrong word that is in error, but we have nevertheless corrected the spelling of the word "clamed" in this claim to read "claimed".

Claims 4 and 9 have also been amended to change the word "colour" to - - color - -, consistent with U.S. practice.

On page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 1 - 11, and 26 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,668,253 (Thompson et al.). For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed. In this regard, the application presently contains one independent claim, namely Claim 1, which has been amended (as discussed below), to more clearly differentiate it from Thompson et al.

As should be appreciated Thompson et al. relates to an enterprise information management system (see title). Columns 7 to 9 of Thompson et al. appear to be the most relevant. In particular, col. 7, lines 55 - 61 explain that the architecture of the Enterprise Information Management (EIM) system comprises workstations 102-1, 102-2, 102-3 and 102-4 "connected" to a Data Warehouse server 104 via a web server 106 and so access to the EIM system is achieved through web browsers of client workstations 102. Referring to col. 8, lines 6-

7, a sample user interface is shown in Fig. 2.

The example provided in Thompson et al. relates to an automobile dealership and provides an upper left-hand corner for branding information, or the like, which is customizable (col. 8, lines 9-15). The user interface layout of Fig. 2 also shows a left hand task list (col. 8, lines 15-16) that is used for displaying data subject areas and reports and analyses (col. 8, lines 19-20). As explained at col. 8, lines 23-24, the task-related data and output resides in a content area.

In order to aid the non-technical associate or executive, the EIM system provides easy access to key performance indicators through “quick views” or “Home pages”, an example of which is shown in Fig. 3 (col. 8, lines 36-40). According to col. 8, lines 41-45, the home page provides one to four reports or graphs displayed on one screen (in the content area mentioned above) in order to provide the user with the ability to cluster high-focus items onto one screen of information, which greatly increases the ability to monitor the business’ key performance indicators.

In order to allow a user to analyze data “behind” the graphs, the EIM system provides a set of predefined drill paths or “next steps” (col. 8, lines 54-56). The purpose of the predefined next steps is to display additional information reports with new, more detailed, or related information concerning a report currently being viewed (col. 8, lines 56-59). At this stage, it should be pointed out that this does not result in the screen shown schematically in Fig. 4. In this respect, as explained in col. 9, lines 10-16, while viewing the Home page, the user can choose to take any of the reports to a full screen mode by clicking a window expansion icon located in the right corner of a report’s title. Results can then be viewed in either a “Grid” or “Graph” mode, the user being able to switch between the two modes. Col. 9, lines 3-6, explains that this feature is shown in Fig. 4, and col. 9, lines 40-41 explains that the report of Fig. 4 is a cross-tab report.

Turning to col. 9, lines 22-25, properties of these reports can be changed dynamically by clicking on the report element to be changed, for example fonts, colors, titles and legends, i.e., attributes of the reports as opposed to actual values contained in the report.

A presently amended Claim 1 calls for an organizational management system exhibiting the following features: (1) an input device, (2) a graphical user interface arranged to display, when in use, a scorecard or other representation of information constituting a hierarchy of intent,

(3) a processor coupled to the input device and the graphical user interface, (4) with the scorecard or other representation of information constituting a hierarchy of intent including a representation of a plurality of indicators associated with the an entity, (5) with the processor being responsive to selection from the plurality of indicators of an indicator using the input device so as to provide access to a plurality of selectable discrete elements that constitute a basis upon which a state of the indicator is determined. The features shown by underlines above are not disclosed or taught by Thompson et al. In short, Thompson et al. fails to teach an organizational management system comprising a graphical user interface arranged to display a scorecard or other representation of information constituting a hierarchy of intent, that the scorecard or other representation of information constituting a hierarchy of intent includes a representation of a plurality of indicators, and a plurality of selectable discrete elements that constitute a basis upon which a state of the indicator is determined, as recited in amended Claim 1.

In this regard, Thompson et al. does not relate to an organizational management system. "Management System" is term of art, for example as defined in Wikipedia as:

'A management system is the framework of processes and procedures used to ensure that an organization can fulfill all tasks required to achieve its objectives.

For instance, an environmental management system enables organizations to improve their environmental performance through a process of continuous improvement. An oversimplification is "Plan, Do, Check, Act."

In contrast, Thompson et al. relates an "Enterprise Information Management System" and the detailed technical realization of information processing and delivery relating thereto. This is different to an organizational management system, because it does not provide the framework for processes or procedures used to ensure that an organization can fulfill all tasks required to achieve its objectives. Furthermore, the EIM of Thompson et al. makes no systematic linkage with organizational objectives, and makes no reference to continuous improvement processes,

for example “Plan-Do-Check-Act”. Hence, Thompson et al. does not teach an organizational management system.

Furthermore, Thompson et al. does not disclose the use of a scorecard or other representation of information constituting a hierarchy of intent. The term “scorecard” is explained in Applicants’ specification as:

‘A known hierarchy of objectives culminating in indicators is referred to as a “Hierarchy of Intent.” A scorecard is an example of a collection of current indicators relating to a policy, program, project or strategy that has been expressed as a Hierarchy of Intent.’

Clearly, Thompson et al. does not disclose the use of a collection of current indicators expressed as a Hierarchy of Intent. Indeed, Thompson et al. is completely silent in relation to the use of Hierarchies of Intent. In contrast, Fig. 3 of Thompson et al. simply shows a collection of indicators, not a scorecard. Furthermore, the display of indicators in Fig. 3 of Thompson et al. does not constitute a Hierarchy of Intent and furthermore Thompson et al. does not disclose a suitable data structure, for example a hierarchical data structure, necessary to support representation as a Hierarchy of Intent.

Additionally, as explained at col. 8, lines 49-50, the Home page contains “canned” reports. Col. 9, lines 40-41 explain that Fig. 4 is a cross-tab report. Thompson et al. does not teach that the data of the graph of Fig. 3 is derived from the report of Fig. 4. More particularly, the Office Action has not demonstrated that the elements of the report of Fig. 4 are a basis upon which a state of the indicator is determined, the indicator also being a report. Expressed differently, the Office Action has not demonstrated a nexus between the elements of Fig.4 being used as a basis for determination and the results of the performance indicator of Fig. 3. Indeed, it is interesting to note that Thompson et al. teaches a “detail listing format” that displays the data

just as it is returned from the data warehouse 104. It therefore stands to reason that the elements of Fig. 4 are based upon data obtained from the data warehouse 104 too.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Thompson et al. does not teach a plurality of discrete elements that constitute a basis upon which a state of the indicator is determined, as recited in amended Claim 1.

In view of the reasoning provided above, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Thompson et al.

Claims 2 - 11, and 26 depend either directly or from Claim 1 and hence are patentable for reasons similar thereto.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN,
COHEN & POKOTILOV, LTD.

By 

Barry A. Stein, Esq.
Registration No. 25,257
Customer No. 03000
(215) 567-2010
Attorneys for Applicant

November 30, 2009

Please charge or credit our
Account No. 03-0075 as necessary
to effect entry and/or ensure
consideration of this submission.